



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

some of the decisions in St. Liguori's Moral Theology. There are two classes of writings on morals by Roman Catholic divines—works on ascetic theology, and on moral theology, the latter being intended as a guide for confessors, the former for the general instruction of the people. The works on moral theology, it is admitted, are often lax enough, the great object being, confessedly, "to find excuses for sinners." The confessor is anxious to relieve the penitent who comes to him *after the sin has been committed* from too overwhelming a remorse; he is desirous to take into account whatever extenuating circumstances there may be in the details of the offence: the very fact of the sinner having come to confession gives him a claim for indulgence; and so the general character of works intended for the guidance of confessors is often such as to leave, on a hasty reader, impressions at variance with the strictness of Catholic morality. But it is said that very different language is used in works on ascetic theology, which are intended for the guidance and "direction" of the Christian; and the same priest would earnestly warn against committing an act a person who should come to him *beforehand* for direction, who, if he were consulted by the same person as a penitent *after* the act was committed, would be anxious to reduce it to a venial sin, or to make out, if possible, that it was no sin at all. And the *Dublin Review* accuses of a gross blunder, not to say of culpable carelessness or dishonesty, those Protestants who have treated Liguori's Moral Theology as if it could ever be used by Roman Catholics in the way of "direction."

In our article in the year 1855, we took some pains to show that the defence here set up for the laxity of Liguori's Moral Theology was not a sound one. And without going over the same ground now, we may remark that there might be some justification for this different character of the advice to be given to a man *after* committing a sin and *before* it, if one who committed a sin once was in no danger of ever doing the like again. But as things are, it is evident that the advice given a penitent *after* one commission of a sin, is *before* his next commission of it. And if the confessor, after the event, exercise his Moral Theology in finding excuses for the sinner, and satisfying him that the act was only a venial sin, or no sin at all, he will find it hard to insinuate the lessons of his "ascetic theology," and to make the penitent believe that the same act will be mortal sin the next time he commits it. But whatever may have been the value of the *Dublin Reviewer's* defence of Liguori's Moral Theology, it does not apply to the present case. Father Furniss's tract is a work on ascetic theology, little as our readers might suppose so. It is not intended for the consolation of those who *have* fallen into sin, but for the counsel and guidance of those who desire to know how they may avoid falling into sin. It is the department of moral teaching in which the Church of Rome promises to give a specimen of her greatest strictness. The *Dublin Reviewer* while he warns us that we are not to look for severe decisions in the department of Moral Theology, takes credit for all the strictness that can be desired in this department of teaching. The Church, he says, must take the world as it is, and not as she would wish it to be, and, therefore, while she *teaches* according to the strictest standard, she *decides* according to the most equitable one. If, then, her *teaching* fall below the standard of even heathen morality, can the Church of Rome venture to claim to be the infallible interpreter of the doctrine of Christ.

But it may be asked (and a correspondent has asked),^a why make the Church of Rome responsible for Father Furniss's publication? Do we make the Church of England responsible for every unwise publication that proceeds from the pen of one of her priests or even of one of her bishops?

There is this great difference, that the Church of Rome claims to be an infallible guide to her members, and insists on the necessity of their learning their religion not from books, but from a living, speaking guide, always at hand and ready to be consulted. A Roman Catholic layman cannot go to decrees of councils to learn the doctrines of his Church, he must go for them to his priest; and this is the very way in which Roman Catholic divines maintain that he may learn them with infallible certainty. "Most likely," says Dr. Milner, "the Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of the Church from his parish priest, but then he knows that the doctrine of this priest must be conformable to that of his bishop, and that otherwise he will soon be called to account for it. He knows also that the doctrine of the bishop himself must be conformable to that of the other bishops and the Pope; and that it is a fundamental maxim with them all never to admit of any tenet but such as is believed by all the bishops, and was believed by their predecessors up to the Apostles themselves." Thus we see that the way in which the Church of Rome carries out her claim to be a living, speaking, infallible guide, is by giving a power of attorney to her priests to speak for her, and she must accordingly be held responsible for the teaching which they actually put forth. Now, in Father Furniss's case, it is not a mere presumption that the doctrine of the priest is in conformity with the doctrine of the bishop, for his work bears the imprimatur of Dr. Paul Cullen,

the authorized representative of the Pope and virtual head of the Roman Catholic Church in this country; and it is not a mere presumption that the doctrine of the bishop is in conformity with that of other bishops and of the Pope; for the writer Alphonsus Liguori, from whom the teaching of the work in question has been borrowed, has been canonized as a saint by the same Pope, the sacred congregation of rites having decreed unanimously that in all his works examined according to the discipline of the Apostolic See there was nothing worthy of censure.

We feel confident, then, that we have brought home this book to the Church of Rome. This is her teaching, and the only question is, is it good teaching? Remember that the Church of Rome demands that we should absolutely submit our private judgment to her, on the ground that she is infallible, and can *never* err. If, then, a single instance can be brought forward in which it can be proved that she *has* erred, her whole claim falls to the ground, and she is a convicted impostor. She is proved to have demanded the obedience of Christian people on false pretences, and to have promised them an immunity from error, which she is not able to realize. In the words of the motto of a Roman Catholic book, which has lately been advertised in the newspapers, "*the Church which can be convicted of one single error cannot be the pillar and ground of the truth.*" In points of speculative doctrine it may not be always easy to convince one brought up from childhood to believe in the infallibility of his Church, that she has actually erred, even in the case of the very newest of her doctrines, and that least supported by tradition, such for instance as the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Protestants, indeed, are amazed at the boldness of making an assertion respecting an event which happened nearly two thousand years ago, in the absence of the testimony of any one who lived within a thousand years of the time; and, notwithstanding that Roman Catholic divines held, not fifty years ago, that the Church had no tradition on the subject. (See Milner's *End of Controversy*.) Still Roman Catholics are trained to take the assertion of their Church in lieu of all other evidence, and are contented with the impossibility of any one proving a negative on the subject. But when the question is one not of speculation but of practice, when an attempt is made to tamper with the immutable laws of morality, we know that honest and upright Roman Catholics have a voice within their hearts which tells them, if they will listen to it, this doctrine is not true.

Let priests and bishops and pope join together to tell us not to curse our parents in *their presence*, or call them bad names in *their hearing*, let them assure us that the ordinary obligations to honesty may give way if there is a "common custom" to the contrary, or if they stand in the way of our gaining a "reasonable profit," and still we hope that there are many of our Roman Catholic brethren who would tell priest and bishop and pope, "we know that this teaching is false." And when the bishops and pope go on to say that it is a fundamental maxim with them never to admit of any tenet but such as was believed by their predecessors up to the Apostles themselves, does not the falsehood of the assertion become so glaring as to excite a smile. The Apostles the authors of teaching such as this! Who could be persuaded that anyone ever learned from the Apostles rules to enable a child to curse his parents innocently by going out of their hearing, or to enable a shopkeeper to cheat his customers without sin, when his profits are too small, or when others set him the example!

Perhaps, however, some Roman Catholic priest will say, "We do not pretend that we learned these lessons from the Apostles. We only claim to have been taught by them in matters of faith, and we pretend to no infallibility on matters affecting practice. We maintain that God has interfered by special miracles to guard our speculative belief from the least admixture of error, but in all questions of morals we are left to the uncertainties of private judgment." The statement of this theory is a sufficient refutation of it. As if Christianity were only intended to gratify curiosity, only meant to make us wiser, and not to make us better, and as if sanctity of life were not as much the great object of its founder as purity of faith. Are we to believe that God interferes by miraculous gifts to secure the latter, while he is indifferent about the former? Roman Catholics certainly regard the smallest error in an article of faith as of infinitely more dangerous consequences than the grossest violation of Christian duty. A Roman Catholic will regard the most virtuous of Protestants as having less hope in his death than the most abandoned profligate who has always held the right faith. Nay, it matters not whether he has had a correct knowledge of the right faith, provided that he has lived in the communion of the right Church, and not wilfully contradicted her tenets. The Church of Rome has methods to make the death-bed comfortable of one who has lived his whole lifetime through in ignorance of the doctrines of the Gospel, and in violation of its precepts. Implicit faith will supply the defects of his belief, and a relaxed morality will find excuses for the obligations of his practice.

Roman Catholics, we call on you to judge whether the teachers of such doctrines as these are the followers of the Apostles.

They made no attempt to accommodate the strictness of Gospel morality to the practices of the world; nor would they accept outward submission to their authority as any substitute for the purity of Christian faith and practice. With these modern teachers, on the contrary, to be included in the outward communion of their Church is everything; and since they cannot make the world "such as they would wish it to be" they confessedly lower their standard of morality to that which will be acceptable to the world as it is. Do not these modern teachers show their object to be, not to build up living members of the body of Christ, walking in true holiness before Him, but to gain on any terms proselytes and adherents to themselves. And may we not conclude with certainty that they are not the followers of the Apostles who "preached not themselves, but Christ Jesus our Lord."

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

(Continued from page 4.)

WE have hitherto viewed the invocation of saints in the light in which Roman Catholics wish it to appear, and which they deem most advantageous to their cause; and we have seen, that even thus viewed that practice is without any, the slightest foundation in God's word, and, in point of fact, an useless, dangerous, and unchristian invention. But we must go beyond this; for, while Romanists say they merely solicit the prayers of the saints, they do not fairly represent the teaching and authorized practices of their Church. Whatever they may say to the contrary, the fact is, that they do worship the saints, and do regard them as more than mere intercessors. They regard the saints as more than mere intercessors, since they rely on their merits to obtain the divine favour. In the Canon of the Mass, after enumerating several saints, the officiating priest prays—"By whose (the saints) merits and prayers thou wouldst grant that we may be fortified by the help of thy protection, through the same Jesus Christ, Amen." Here, God's blessing is sought for the sake of the merits of the saints, which is making them mediators of atonement. We might furnish a large number of examples of other prayers in which the merits of the saints are alleged as a ground of confidence in approaching God. Any one may find abundance of them in the Roman Missal, and in other Romish devotional books. Romanists, also, in invoking the prayers of the saints, and supposing that they can hear and know concerning their various petitions, necessarily admit them to be omniscient.^b If they be not omniscient, they cannot know concerning all the persons soliciting their aid in all parts of the world, at the same time, with untold purposes and motives. If there be one thing that a saint does not know, that one thing may be the prayer of some poor Romanist; and the only security that any one can have that a saint knows anything of his petition to him, is that the said saint knows everything. The same may be said of angels. Now, this matter has sorely puzzled Roman Catholic divines. St. Isidore, of Seville, who, by the way, cannot be called a Roman Catholic in the full sense of the term, says, "The angels understood all things in the word of God before they came to pass, and those things which to men are yet future they know at present, by the revelation of God."^c In another part of his works, describing the blessed, he quotes that passage—"they are as the angels which are in heaven."^d Peter Lombard maintains the affirmative of the proposition, "that what is said concerning the angels relates also to the souls of the saints."^e The consequence of all this is, that saints and angels are omniscient; that is, possessed of one of the peculiar attributes of Deity. But to suppose them omniscient is to set them up as God, and is plainly idolatrous. To avoid this idolatrous consequence, which is fairly the result of Roman Catholic teachings, and the plainly expressed opinions of St. Isidore, the schoolmen, and the Roman doctors in general, resort to the notion that the saints behold in the word of God (i.e., Christ), as in a mirror, the petitions that are offered to them on earth, and whether they may be granted or not. The whim is apparently founded on a passage in St. Augustine,^f which has been dragged forward on all occasions by Roman Catholic divines, though that Father's meaning was quite different from theirs. Referring to this, Peter Lombard says, "For as to the angels, so also to the saints, who assist God, our petitions are made known in the Word of God, which they contemplate. Whence, also, they are said to offer to God our prayers and vows, not because they would teach God, but because they consult his will with respect to those things."^g But this does not remove the difficulty; it makes it greater—at the same time that it is itself only a fanciful conjecture. If the saints know things in the divine Word, they know all things; or if they do not know all things, that of which they are ignorant may, for aught any one knows, be the very prayer which he is pouring forth to them.

But Romanists not only call upon the saints to pray

^a "Ordo Missae."

^b We only use the word "omniscient" here for want of a more suitable one, with reference to what is passing in our own world, and not with reference to the whole universe. See our last January number, p. 11.

^c S. Isidori, Sententiar, lib. I., cap. x. 17, tom. vi., p. 137. Roma, 1802

^d Mark xii., 25.

^e Petri Lombardi Sententiar, lib. iv., Dist. xlv. Paris, 1545, p. 389.

^f Augustin De Civ. Dei, lib. xi., cap. xxix., tom. vii., p. 295, Ben Ed.

^g Petri Lombardi Sententiar, lib. iv., Dist. xlv., p. 388 b.

for them, but they offer prayers *directly to them*, as for instance in the following examples of popular prayers:—
 “We fly to thy patronage, O Holy Mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O Holy and Blessed Virgin.”

“Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope, to thee do we cry, poor banished sons of Eve; sighing and weeping in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious advocate, the eyes of thy mercy towards us, and when this our exile is ended, show unto us Jesus, the blessed fruit of thy womb. O clement, O pious, O sweet Virgin Mary.”

Such quotations might be multiplied to almost any extent: the like may be found in most of the Roman Catholic books of devotion. (See p. 34, *infra*.)

Roman Catholics, also, avowedly *worship* the saints with a religious worship. The Council of Trent and Pope Pius' Creed merely enjoin that they are to be “honoured and invoked,” without determining as to how much that honour ought to be. The schoolmen tell us, however, that there are three kinds of religious service, to wit, *Douleia*, which is due to the saints and angels in general; *Hyperdouleia*, which is due to the Virgin Mary alone; and *Latreia*, which belongs only to God. Now, this is merely a verbal distinction, and cannot be of the least use in the practice of devotion. Add to this that the great bulk of Romanists in all lands are quite ignorant of such a distinction. One might as well talk in Arabic to the peasantry of Italy or Ireland as speak of *Douleia*, *Hyperdouleia*, and *Latreia*. When a Romanist at Mass, or elsewhere, repeats the “*Confiteor*”—“I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to Blessed Michael the Archangel,” &c., can he, even if possessed of the most acute and philosophic mind, keep in view the distinction of *Douleia*, *Hyperdouleia*, and *Latreia*, so as to render to God, Mary, and Michael the amount of devotion due to each of them respectively? The thing is impossible. This distinction of them is merely ideal, and utterly impractical. In fact, it is only a subterfuge to get rid of the charge of idolatry, so justly preferred against the Romish Church on the ground of the worship of saints. But it is also unscriptural. Holy Scripture represents genuine religious worship as being of *one* kind only, and as due to God alone. It requires the total surrender of the heart and affections to Him, and we cannot, without idolatry, offer this service in whole or in part to any other being whatever.

The difference between the words *Δουλεία douleia*, and *Λατρεία latreia*, consists in this, that the former denotes a more complete and abject dependence than the latter. *Λατρεύω latreuō*, means to serve as a hired servant, or voluntarily to perform the office of a servant. *Δουλεύω douleuō*, means to be in the condition of a slave, and to serve in that capacity. *Λατρεία latreia*, denotes service that is in some measure voluntary. *Δουλεία douleia*, signifies bondage, or the service of a slave, who is the entire property of his master. So that *douleia* expresses a greater depth of humiliation and subjection than *latreia*. In the Greek original of the New Testament, *δουλεία douleia*, and its cognate forms, are used to denote the service due to God; while in the ancient Greek versions of the Old Testament *λατρεία latreia* sometimes signifies that which one man renders to another. But whatever be the significations of these words, either in classical authors, or in the New Testament, or in the writings of the schoolmen, it is evident that the distinction which these last have made is, in matter of fact and practically a mere nullity. At all events, Romish divines, by avowedly worshipping the saints with what they term *Douleia*, show that they act disingenuously, when they pretend that they only solicit their intercession.

But Roman Catholic doctors in their writings set forth the Virgin Mary and saints as in some sense their saviours, and speak of them in terms of plainly idolatrous signification. We need not quote the extravagant and impious language of Liguori and Bonaventure, sanctioned though it be by the highest authority in the Romish Church. Most of our readers are already acquainted with it—we prefer, therefore, giving some quotations which are less known, and which are of scarcely less idolatrous import. We shall begin with St. Thomas Aquinas. He says, “For in peril thou canst obtain safety from the glorious virgin herself; whence it is said (Cantic. iv. 4.), ‘a thousand shields;’ that is, remedies against perils, ‘depend from thee.’” Also, in every work of virtue thou mayest have her for thy help, and therefore she says (Eccle. xxiv. 25.), ‘In me is all hope of life and virtue.’” Thus, then, is her grace full; she also exceeds the angels in the plenitude of grace, and on this account she is fitly called *Mary*, which, interpreted, *she is illuminated in herself*; whence (Isa. lviii. 11) it is said, ‘He shall fill thy soul with splendours.’ And she illuminates others, even so much as the whole world; wherefore she is compared to the sun and moon.”¹ Gabriel Biel, a scholastic divine of the fifteenth century, writes, “From which it appears, that our prayers and hope of happiness to be procured by the mediation of the saints, are not vain; but, in the order appointed by God, we ought to fly to their help, and always to beseech them with due veneration, that we may be saved by their merits and prayers.”² Again he says of the Mass, that it is offered

in “memory of the Apostles and Martyrs, and especially of the glorious Virgin, that by their intercession we may be brought forward from faith to sight; from the race to the goal; from the journey to the land to which we are journeying.”³ St. Bernard, of Clairvaux, who, however, it will be recollected, did not write till the 12th century, and, notwithstanding his extravagant adulation of the Virgin, was a decided opponent of the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception, says:—

“We will say a few things also concerning this name (Mary), which is interpreted star of the sea, and is very conveniently adapted to the Virgin Mother. For she is most fitly compared to a star; because, as without marring of itself, the star emits its ray, so, *sine lesione*, the virgin brought forth a son. As the ray of the star does not diminish its brilliancy, so neither does the son of the virgin her integrity. She is, therefore, that noble star arisen from Jacob,⁴ whose ray enlightens the whole world—whose brightness shines resplendent in heaven, and whose, penetrating hell and illuminating earth, and warming minds rather than bodies, nourishes virtues and dries up vices. She, I say, is that illustrious and glorious star, which of necessity raised aloft above this large and spacious sea, glitters in her merits, and enlightens by her example * * * whom following thou dost not go astray, beseeching her thou dost not despair, thinking of her thou dost not err, with her holding thee thou dost not fall, with her protecting thee thou dost not fear, with her for thy leader thou dost not grow weary.”⁵

This passage is a favourite one with Roman Catholics, being quoted at large in the Roman Breviary; also by Gabriel Biel⁶ above mentioned, and other Roman Catholic authorities. This same St. Bernard says in another place, “That I may say a few things out of many. What other woman does God appear to thee to have predicted, when He said to the serpent, ‘I will put enmity between thee and the woman.’ And if thou still doubtest that He did not say this concerning Mary, hear what follows—‘*she shall bruise thy head*.’ To whom is this victory reserved except to Mary?”⁷ And again, “With all the marrow of our hearts, with all the affections and desires of our whole soul, let us venerate this Mary; because such is his will, who wishes us to have all through Mary.”⁸ Albert the Great, Bishop of Ratisbon, and one of the greatest of the scholastic writers, says of the Virgin Mary, “This is the rising Morning, from which has arisen the Sun of righteousness, and healing in his wings (Malach. iv.). And thence she is the illuminatrix. This is the star arisen from Jacob (Num. 24.) And thence she is the star of the sea. This is the Queen who has stood forth (Ps. 44) in a variety of virtues, in golden apparel, in the splendour of Deity coming upon her. And thence she is the Lady. This is the propitiatory (mercy seat) upon which God is propitiated with regard to sinners.”⁹ Pope Gregory XVI., in his encyclical letter, dated August 16th, 1832, styles the Virgin Mary “*our greatest hope; yea, the entire ground of our hope*.” We might give very many more similar quotations, but we fear making our paper too tedious. We cannot, however, pass by the following from the “Glories of St. Joseph,” a popular book of devotion among Roman Catholics, which we have noticed in a former number:—¹⁰

“Most adorable Jesus, most admirable Mary, most amiable Joseph, wonderful Trinity of three persons, the most holy that ever has been, or ever shall be in this world, prostrate at your feet, in union of all the humility and devotion of heaven and earth, I hail, honour, and love you in every way in my power.”

“O most adorable Jesus, O most amiable Mary, O most dear Joseph, I give myself up entirely to you—take possession of me for ever,” &c.¹¹

With such an address as this before him, who can talk of *Douleia*, *Hyperdouleia*, and *Latreia*? Who can keep such a distinction in mind, while addressing Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in the same breath and in the same terms? By what scale or spiritual thermometer is he to regulate his devotion, so as to render to each “due honour?” With such an address before him, who can have the boldness to say that Roman Catholics merely *ask the prayers of the saints*?

It is said that Christ is too high—too holy, for us, sinful creatures, to approach. But is He not the intercessor who is to plead on behalf of sinners like us? Does He not invite *all* to come to Him, saying—“Come unto Me *ALL* you that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest?” And does He not promise, “Him that cometh to me I will not cast out?” True, says the Romanist, but He is so far removed from us by His supreme Divinity, that we require some one who approaches nearer to our own nature, who can inspire us with greater confidence, and to whom we can have access without that fear

we necessarily feel in the Divine presence. But Christ approaches as near to our nature as any human being whatever, sin only excepted. He is perfect man, “being in all things made like unto his brethren;” so that there is not any respect in which a Romanist can say that the saints approach nearer to our state; not a single reason which he can assign for having recourse to their intercession, and which we cannot wrest from him, and show that it rather proves that we ought to go immediately to Christ. And as to angels, it cannot be said that their nature more nearly approaches ours than the perfect manhood of Jesus. They never had human infirmities; never endured temptation, nor underwent human suffering, as Jesus did; and, consequently, they are unable to sympathise with us as He does, in our seasons of trial. “We have not,” says St. Paul, “an High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are; yet, without sin. Let us, THEREFORE, come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.” We need not go to other intercessors; we find all in Christ. He is able to hear and grant our petitions—He has grace for all our need—sympathy for all our sufferings—merit for all our unworthiness; and He holds forth to us abundant gracious invitations and promises of acceptance. During His earthly career, He never sent away any that came to Him in faith; never told any to seek the intercession of others, but always invited all to come to Him. Frequently, indeed, did He rebuke the mistaken zeal of his disciples, who would have kept back those that came to Him—they would have kept back the Canaanitish woman, poor blind Bartimeus, and the little children. But not so, Jesus; He would have all to come to Him. He is more likely to receive us graciously than are any of His saints; they may repel us, but if we only come to Him, He will kindly embrace us. We may, then, as St. Paul says, “Come boldly.” He whose tender heart melted with compassion when he saw the only son of the widow of Nain stretched on the funeral bier; who shed tears of patriot sorrow over apostate Jerusalem, as He beheld its fated walls and doomed terraces rising before Him; who wept with truly human love at the grave of His friend Lazarus: He is still the same—the same loving, sympathising Jesus. Still able to melt at human woe—still full of pity and mercy for the afflicted and the erring. He is also the appointed “way” by whom we have access to God.¹² Let us follow in that “way”—let us avoid all bye paths, and pursue that only sure and legitimate means of access to God and heaven. By going to saints and angels we may miss Christ; by setting up mediators to ourselves, we may lose the mediation of that divinely appointed Mediator, who intercedes for sinners at his Father’s right hand. We know of a surety that He always hears us, and is able to grant our requests. “Behold, the Lord’s hand is not shortened that it cannot save—neither His ear heavy that it cannot hear.” His arm is ever outstretched with salvation and bounty; His ear is always open to our prayers. “O Thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come.” But we know of none other that can hear or help; none that will so graciously receive us; none on whom we may so securely depend. In fine, we may say with the Psalmist of old, “Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee.”

In conclusion, we must repeat what we have once before suggested, that this worship of saints is only a modified form of ancient polytheism. In the primitive times of Christianity, it was the glory of its professors to say, “To us there is but one God, the Father, by whom are all things, and we by Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him.”¹³ And this they could say in opposition and contradiction to the “gods many” and “lords many” of the surrounding gentiles. In succeeding ages, when the religion of the despised Nazarene became patronized by the great ones of this world, many joined in its ranks, and assumed the name of Christian, while their hearts were unchanged and uncleansed by the Spirit of God. These brought into their religious creed and worship many of the opinions and practices of the false religions in which they had been educated, and whose poisoned roots had not been eradicated from their minds. They found it hard to give up their “gods many” and “lords many;” the Christian religion, with its “one God” and “one Mediator,” looked very bald and bare in eyes accustomed to a host of divinities, great and small. So it seemed both convenient and natural to put the saints and martyrs of the Christian Church in the place of the demigods of polytheism. By this means Christianity appeared more full and complete to pagan minds, and the transition became easy from the old gods of poetry and mythology to the more genteel and modern semi-deities of Christian romance. Thus, what we cannot but consider a base compromise was made with the idolatry of the nations: Christianity was semi-paganized, while pagans were semi-Christianized. The dreadful consequences of this have since appeared in the corruption of the doctrines of the Church, and the establishment of a system over a large portion of the world which combines in itself, in one heterogeneous and incoherent mass, the elements of Judaism, polytheism, and Christianity.

¹ Cor. viii., 6.

¹ Thomas Aquinas de Satisfactione Angelica expositio. Opusc. viii., Ven. 1776.

² Gabrielis Biel expositio Can. Missæ, Lect. xxx. Lugd. 1500, f. 57 b.

³ Idem.

⁴ Num. xiv., 17.

⁵ S. Bernardi Abbatis, super Missæ est Homilia 2, sect. 17, col. 1263-1264, tom. i. Paris, 1839. Op. Tom. 1, p. 749, Ben. Ed. Paris, 1719.

⁶ Gabrielis Biel expositio Can. Missæ, Lect. xxxii., f. 61, b.

⁷ S. Bernard Abbatis de Laudibus V.M., Hom. 2, sect. 14, col. 1674 c. Paris, 1839.

⁸ Sermo in Nativit. V. B. Mariæ, &c., Op. Bern. tom. 1, p. 1019, Ben. Ed. Paris, 1719.

⁹ Alberti Magni comment in Matth. i., sub. Mariæ, p. 12, col. 2, tom. ix. Paris, 1651.

¹⁰ Catholic Layman, vol. v., p. 82.

¹¹ Glories of Saint Joseph, p. 327. Dublin, 1843.